

Correlates of Commitment To  
Community Development Efforts

Ted L. Napier and Richard C. Maurer<sup>1</sup>

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology  
The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and  
The Ohio State University

<sup>1</sup>Associate professor of sociology and research associate respectively in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, The Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center and the Ohio State University. Funding for the data collection phase of this study was provided through Title V of the Rural Development Act.

## ABSTRACT

A "vested interest" theoretical perspective was created to explain the relationship of perceived benefit and commitment of resources to community development programs. The theoretical model was tested in the context of rural industrial and outdoor recreation development. The study was conducted within five counties in southeastern Ohio. The findings demonstrated that people are motivated to commit resources to development programs when they believe that they will benefit from the development action. The findings are discussed in terms of how action agents can use the results of the study during the implementation stage of development activities.

## Correlates of Commitment To Community Development Efforts

One of the necessary but not sufficient conditions for the accomplishment of community development goals is a firm commitment on the part of directly involved people to allocate limited resources for use in development programs. Community development practitioners who employ the consensus oriented social action process (Beal, 1958, 1964; Powers, 1971; Cary, 1971) as well as the proponents of a conflict oriented development ideology (Alinsky, 1971; Erlich, 1974; Havens, 1971; Flacks, 1974) are agreed that commitment from people affected by development action is essential throughout the change process. The success or failure of community development programs oftentimes hinges upon the willingness of directly affected community residents to accept responsibility for a part of the costs associated with development efforts. This is true even when local community groups are "vertically linked"<sup>2</sup> (Warren, 1972) with external groups which are willing to assume a significant portion of the development costs, such as financial support and/or the provision of technical expertise.

Some of the costs which must be borne by local groups engaged in community development efforts are: (1) allocation of personal time for program planning and implementation, (2) contribution of personal economic resources, (3) allocation of financial resources from collective sources (taxes or federal revenue sharing), (4) political involvement and compliance to new laws so that development is possible (land use

---

<sup>2</sup>Vertical linkages refer to interdependency between communities or organizations and usually represents a situation in which local groups are subordinate to larger social entities such as regional, state or national groups.

controls); (5) willingness to accept both positive and negative social consequences of change, (6) willingness to use persuasion or coercion to motivate people to action (may cost friendships), and (7) willingness to accept changes in the physical environment.

While it is relatively simple to identify resources needed to accomplish development objectives, it is difficult and often time consuming to create the situation where people become committed to development goals to the extent that they are willing to contribute resources to planned change efforts. Most people realize that the number of development problems a community group may attempt to solve at any specific time is quite small. The selection of a particular development project for funding may prevent the implementation of other equally valued programs since resources are limited. For example, should community residents decide to allocate development resources for the creation of a sewage treatment project, a new recreation facility may by necessity be postponed indefinitely even though it is also perceived to have high priority.

The decision making process relative to the selection of projects to be supported involves consideration of many factors but ultimately consists of an assessment of costs and benefits which are associated with various development alternatives. Groups must weigh the costs and benefits of alternative development programs and select the project or projects that will return the greatest benefits for the fewest costs. The costs of development must, however, be assessed from a sociological as well as an economic perspective. Some projects may be economically very rewarding but be defined as quite costly when sociological factors are considered. For example, development efforts may increase the

economic status of a community group and reduce regional unemployment but may also result in a rapid increase in crime and delinquency. Such a situation could easily be viewed as highly undesirable from a cost-benefit assessment when the social costs are considered.

Once a community group has determined its development priorities and has selected the program objectives which it will attempt to accomplish, the most critical stage of the development process is encountered. This is the implementation stage which requires that community members move beyond lip-service<sup>3</sup> to social action. This means that resources must be made accessible to the development agents for the accomplishment of the program goals. It is often easy for people to abstractly favor programs which do not have direct costs associated with them but positive attitudes may change quickly if people realize a program is going to "cost" them something. Community members, for example, may favor long range community planning as long as they are not called upon to directly participate in the planning efforts or asked to finance a study but become opposed to planning if they believe that such efforts will cost them time or money.

Relatively little is known about why people favor some development programs and appear eager to commit resources to realize the goals of the change efforts but become equally opposed to other development projects. Little empirical research has been completed in the area of commitment to development. What little research exists in this research area is associated with the commitment of personal time. Many writers

---

<sup>3</sup>Lip-service refers to a situation in which people give verbal support to a project but are not willing to make other needed resources available for development efforts.

in the field of community development have recognized the importance of time commitments to change programs (Bottum, 1974; Wiledon, 1970; Good-enough, 1963; Cary, 1970) but other types of commitment such as financial support and acceptance of land use controls for development purposes have received practically no research attention. This study was designed to address commitment from a broader perspective than commitment of personal time. To provide some insight into why people should or should not be willing to commit resources for development programs, a study was designed to accomplish two major objectives: (1) to assess the correlates of personal commitment to selected community development programs, and (2) to test a "vested interest" theoretical perspective formulated to explain commitment motivation. The purpose of this paper is to present the findings of the study and to apply the findings to social action programs.

#### A "Vested Interest" Theoretical Perspective

The basic theoretical position underlying this study is a "vested interest" model which is a product of the application of several components of exchange theory (Turner, 1974; Homans, 1961; Blau, 1964; Simpson, 1974; Ekeh, 1974) to the commitment of individuals to collective community problem solving. The basic thesis of the vested interest perspective is that individuals will be motivated to commit resources to community development efforts which they believe will produce benefits for them. The exchange theory propositions which apply to the vested interest perspective are as follows: (1) people will behave in a manner that will produce personal rewards<sup>4</sup>; (2) people will repeat

---

<sup>4</sup>Rewards (benefits) may take many forms. Some of the most frequent forms of rewards are money, praise, social status, recognition, medals and deference behavior from other people.

behavior which they have discovered has produced desired rewards in the past; (3) individuals will repeat behavior that has produced a desired reward in the past until their need for the reward is basically satisfied at which time the individual will seek other types of activity that they believe will produce different but desired rewards; and (4) individuals will continue to repeat behavior which has produced rewards in the past until the rewards for repeating the behavior cease to be forthcoming (Turner, 1974:211-294).

These four exchange theory propositions form the basic underpinnings of the vested interest perspective which posits that people are motivated to development action by reward systems. If people do not believe that they will receive some benefit from their participation in development programs, they will not contribute to the planned change efforts. Individuals must also receive some immediate rewards for their contribution to the development program or their commitment will be terminated (behavior will not be repeated). People must also see periodic rewards accruing to them or they will not repeat behavior (give more resources to the project). This line of reasoning suggests that people must believe that they will benefit from planned change projects or they will not participate and that participants must be reinforced with rewards from time to time or they will not continue supporting the projects.

#### The Application of "Vested Interests" To Rural Industrial and Outdoor Recreation Development

Rural industrial and outdoor recreation development programs have the potential of producing many types of rewards for groups engaged in such development efforts. Some of the rewards which are frequently associated with these types of development activities are: expanded

employment opportunities, increased tax bases, increased availability of public and private services, new facilities for recreation and numerous other benefits (Whiting, 1974; Jansen, et al., 1971; Barrows and Nilsestuen, 1974). These benefits, however, are not achieved without "investments" on the part of local people. Delineation of the community problem to be solved, planning the program strategies, and efforts to gain public acceptance and support for the development projects often require extensive commitments of personal time since personal contacts are often used to convince people to support the change programs. New land use controls may be required to provide industrial or recreation development sites which means that local land holders must relinquish certain rights to their land (a cost is incurred) so that development is possible. Economic resources also must be made available to the change agents.

A question of primary importance to community development agents is why should people be willing to assume these costs for some projects but not others? A partial explanation to this question may be discovered within the vested interest model. If one accepts the theoretical position that people are motivated to action by rewards, then it should follow that potential contributors to development programs are going to ask who will benefit from the project prior to giving their support. If the benefits primarily accrue to the persons who must assume the costs or to friends and family, then they should be more supportive. If, however, the benefits accrue to people who do not contribute to the creation of the good<sup>5</sup>, then support should be more difficult to secure.

---

<sup>5</sup>A good is defined as any service or material thing which serves to satisfy human wants.



In essence, people do not wish to contribute limited development resources to help people other than themselves or members of their local reference group. Warner and Heffernan (1967) provided support for this position when they observed that people tended to be nonparticipants in organizational meetings if they could benefit from the group's programs without attending meetings. Participation in meetings increased when the benefits were confined to those present at the meetings. These findings suggest that if people are able to benefit from a development project without being required to assume a portion of the costs associated with the project, they will do so.

Both rural industrialization and outdoor recreation development programs have the potential to generate benefits for people far beyond the boundaries of the community in which the development program occurs. While local people may have been primarily responsible for achieving successful industrial and/or outdoor recreation development, the benefits may "spill over" into surrounding towns. Summers, et al., (1976) has shown that towns in close proximity to communities which are experiencing industrial growth oftentimes benefit greatly since workers frequently commute considerable distances to work and spend their wages in communities of residence. The creation of an outdoor recreation facility may serve the needs of people primarily from outside the local community and benefit fewer local people who must partially finance the program.

While the Summers, et al. (1976) observations were made on inter-community bases, the conclusion that benefits of development are not equally distributed could be applied to residents of a community which has achieved development goals. Some people will get jobs while others

may benefit from improved public services. Some may be recognized for their "community spirit" (symbolic reward) and perhaps elected or re-elected to public office as a direct result of their commitments to the development program. Some people may benefit from increased business since new families or higher incomes will increase the volume of sales in local stores. And, of course, some will not benefit at all. The benefits gained from development within a community are not equally distributed.

The vested interest model posits that in situations where the development rewards are distributed in an unequal manner, the strongest commitment will come from those who expect the greatest rewards. From this theoretical position the major hypothesis for testing is as follows: The extent to which a person believes that he/she will benefit<sup>6</sup> from development programs will be significantly related to their willingness to commit resources for development purposes.

#### Social Factors Affecting Potential Benefit

It was reasoned that people with different socio-economic characteristics should differ in terms of the benefits they could expect to receive from development programs which would in turn effect commitment attitudes. The variables selected for theoretical discussion are:

(1) number of children living at home, (2) length of residence in the community, (3) membership in formal organizations, and (4) income.

These variables will be discussed below in the context of commitment of

---

<sup>6</sup>It is recognized that direct benefit to self is not essential to be defined as a reward. Family or close friends may directly benefit and thus be defined as indirect benefit.

resources to development programs.

Individuals who have children living at home should perceive socioeconomic development more favorably than individuals who have basically completed the family life cycle (children have established their own nuclear family units). Since it is highly probable that industrial or recreation development will create new jobs in the local area, the opportunity to find a job in the region should be increased. The children would then have the opportunity to stay in the region rather than forced to migrate for jobs. Family ties within the local area could be maintained. Parents with children living at home should also be concerned about the availability of outdoor recreation facilities for their youngsters. Consequently parents with children living at home should be more willing to allocate resources to increase outdoor recreation opportunities within the region than persons without children to benefit from recreation development. It was, therefore, hypothesized that individuals with children living at home will be more willing to commit limited resources to industrial and outdoor recreation development than those who no longer have children living at home. The commitment should also increase as the number of children increase since families with the largest number of children should have a greater probability of benefiting from development programs.

Persons who have lived within the same community for long periods of time will have established some form of coping<sup>7</sup> with the processes of

---

<sup>7</sup>Coping refers to the ability of the individual to accommodate change and does not connote a stagnant situation in which no change takes place. People learn to cope with the rate of change as it exists within the group.

change which will have been operative within their community. The introduction of change producing programs such as industrial and outdoor recreation development activities will disrupt the established social situation and thus require restructuring. The disruptive effects of the change producing forces may be considered social costs which must be offset by direct benefits to the affected people. This means that development benefits must be received by long term residents for them to be favorable but the probability of long term residents receiving direct benefits from industrial and outdoor recreation development is questionable. Persons who tend to have the longest tenure within established rural community groups are the elderly. They tend to be less educated and have fewest industrial skills. The age factor would also tend to reduce participation in outdoor recreation activity (Neulinger, 1976: 95-97). Industrial groups seek young people to work in the factories (Bertrand and Osborne, 1959, 1960) thus long term residents would probably not receive jobs.

Certain taxes (i.e., property taxes) may increase if development efforts are successful and if the area attracts young families with children. Increased demands will be made upon the education system which will require greater financial support from property taxes. The aged tend to live on fixed incomes that are quite low and any increment in tax burden has significant negative consequences for them. Development efforts that tend to produce tax increases should not be favored by long term residents. It was, therefore, reasoned that length of residence will be negatively associated with willingness to commit personal resources for industrial and outdoor recreation development.

Stratification variables should be related to the commitment of

personal resources for development purposes, since persons of higher classes should be better able to contribute economic resources to development programs. The poor and middle classes often do not have the basic necessities and, therefore, do not have resources which may be applied to community development programs. The higher classes will also expect to gain greater rewards from industrial and outdoor recreation development since they have the resources to take advantage of emerging economic opportunities resulting from development efforts. The lower classes are also less involved in organizational structures from which they may gain recognition (symbolic rewards) for their efforts. It was, therefore, reasoned that stratification variables will be positively related to commitment to industrial and outdoor recreation development efforts.

Social Survey Data  
Used to Test a Theory

A research study was organized using social survey methods to involve a large number of local people in the decision-making process relating to the future development planning of a five county area located in southeastern Ohio. The area had experienced extensive socio-economic decline for many years until the resurgence of deep shaft mining brought renewed economic growth. A five county region became the focus of significant development efforts from many change groups both from within the region and interested agencies located outside the area. The change groups identified two development areas of major interest which were outdoor recreation and rural industrial development. The survey was designed to assess the attitudes of local people toward these and other development alternatives (Napier, et al., 1977). One

aspect of the study was devoted to the assessment of personal commitment of resources for the accomplishment of recreation and industrial development programs. These data provided the opportunity to evaluate the hypotheses developed from the vested interests perspective presented above.

#### Sampling

Data from 1493 families who resided within the designated five county study area were collected in the Fall of 1975, using systematic random sampling of occupied residences (Napier, 1976). Personal interviews using structured questionnaires were employed in the data collection phase of the study. Approximately 95 percent of the people asked to participate in the study consented to do so. This high rate of participation was at least a partial function of the people's expressed interest in contributing to the future development planning of their region.

The location of each selected household was noted on detailed county maps showing occupied residences and the sampling distribution was monitored throughout the data collection period. Evaluation of the sample distribution at the conclusion of the data collection phase of the research process revealed the method had produced a representative sample. Disaggregation of the sample on a township basis was undertaken to compare the actual number of people drawn proportionately from each township to the number that should have been drawn on a probability basis. The sample distribution was very close to the expected. The characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.

(Table 1 here)

### Measurement of Variables

The scale used to measure personal commitment to development efforts was formulated using four Likert-type (Edwards, 1957) attitude items included in the survey. Weighting values of 5 through 1 were applied to the responses.<sup>8</sup> Item analysis was used to evaluate the reliability of the scale which produced a Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficient (Kuder and Richardson, 1937; Johnson and McCabe, 1975) of 0.6905. This coefficient indicates that the responses to the four items were internally consistent and could be combined into a reliable scale. The responses to the four items were summed to form a composite index. The range of possible scores was 4 through 20 with 20 indicating very strong commitment and 4 indicating very little commitment.<sup>9</sup> The scale items and reliability measures are presented in Table 2.

(Table 2 here)

### Operationalization of Independent Variables

The variables selected for analysis as independent variables were: perceived benefit to family members, perceived benefit to region from industrial development, perceived benefit to region from outdoor recreation development, length of residence in the region, number of children living at home, organizational membership and income.

The three attitude items used to evaluate perceived benefit were:

---

<sup>8</sup>Strongly agree was equal to 5, agree equal to 4, undecided equal to 3, disagree equal to 2, and strongly disagree equal to 1.

<sup>9</sup>The grand mean for the composite scale was 13.2 with a standard deviation of 3.4.

1. Someone in my household would qualify for some of the new jobs formed by outdoor recreation or industrial development (benefit to self).
2. Industrial development will benefit my region (industrial benefit to region).
3. My region will not benefit much from new outdoor recreational development (recreation benefit to region).<sup>10</sup>

The number of children living at home at the time of the study composed the variable termed "children."

Length of residence in the region was measured in years of residence in the designated study area and was termed "tenure."

The respondents were asked to designate the number of formal organizations to which they belonged and the variable was termed "groups."

Income was measured in terms of \$1,000 categories ranging from 0 - 999 to 20,000 and above. Weights of 1 through 21 were assigned to each category with the lowest income category receiving a value of 1 and the highest category receiving a value of 21.

Multiple correlation and step-wise multiple regression analysis<sup>11</sup> were used to test the validity of the vested interests model. Two assumptions were made relative to the use of the data for regression analysis: (1) there is a linear relationship between each of the

---

<sup>10</sup>The Likert-type scoring for the first two items was 5-4-3-2-1 with strongly agree equal to 5 while strongly disagree was equal to 1. Reverse weighting of 1-2-3-4-5 with strongly agree equal to 1 and strongly disagree equal to 5 was used for item 3. High scores on each of the items indicated perceived benefit.

<sup>11</sup>The only missing data were a five percent refusal to give total family income. Missing income data were assigned the variable mean and included in the data analysis.



independent variables and the commitment scores, and (2) the attitude items produce metric measures (Abelson and Tukey, 1970).

### Findings

The findings basically supported all of the theoretical hypotheses set forth in the theoretical perspective. The magnitude of the relationships were only moderate but quite consistent with the hypotheses. The correlation matrix for the variables used in this study is presented in Table 3.

(Table 3 here)

Inspection of the correlation matrix reveals that all of the independent variables were significantly related in the hypothesized direction to the commitment scale scores. If people perceived that their family members and the region would benefit from the development effort, they exhibited a higher degree of favorability to commit resources for development purposes. The stratification variables were also related in the hypothesized manner. High income people, who were participants in formal organizational structures, tended to be more willing to commit resources to development efforts than low income respondents with few organizational ties. People with children living at home tended to favor commitment of resources while residents who had lived in the region for longer periods of time tended to be less favorable.

Step-wise regression was employed to explore the findings in greater detail. This statistic was used to determine the relative explanatory power of the variables included in the analysis and the findings are presented in Table 4.

(Table 4 here)

The regression findings revealed that the theoretical model explained 29.4 percent of the variance in commitment scores. All of the regression coefficients through step 6 were significant beyond the .05 level. The number of children living at home (children) was not significant (at the .05 level) in reducing the unexplained variance in the commitment scale at step 7. The findings indicate that the variables were basically additive since there was relatively little multicollinearity among the independent variables (see Table 3).

#### Discussion of Findings

The findings strongly support the position that residents in the study area were motivated to commit resources to industrial and outdoor recreation development if they perceived that they or persons in the region (own reference group) would receive benefits from the development action. This means that specific development projects must be shown to produce benefits if individuals are to become active participants in the development programs. Change programs may be justified to people by showing that the change will benefit the region, but a preferred strategy is to demonstrate the combined benefit to the region and to the household.

It is most interesting to note that the stratification variables (income and organizational membership) were relatively unimportant in the explanation of commitment. While these two variables were significant at the .05 level and consistent with the theoretical perspective, the magnitude of the relationships was quite small. Higher status persons had a greater propensity to commit resources to industrial and outdoor recreation development than lower status persons, but the relatively low

association with the dependent variable strongly suggests significant "latent" willingness to commit resources on the part of people in lower income strata and those less active in formal organizations. In light of these findings, the "traditional" development practice of relying primarily upon recognized leaders in higher status positions to initiate and conduct planned change programs (Bottum, 1974; Powers, 1971) appears to have been overemphasized. The data suggest that people from many status levels are willing to commit resources to development efforts.

Although statistically significant and consistent with the stated hypothesis, length of residence in the region was not as important in the explanation of commitment as expected. Persons who were long term residents tended to be less willing to commit resources to industrial and outdoor recreation development than those who had lived in the region for shorter periods of time.<sup>12</sup> If change efforts, such as industrial and outdoor recreation programs, are to be supported by long term residents, more efforts must be directed toward demonstrating benefits that long term residents may expect to gain from such commitment. It should be observed that only industrial and outdoor recreation development were evaluated. Other development programs which are designed primarily for long term residents may be enthusiastically supported by this group of people.

---

<sup>12</sup>Age was correlated with the dependent variable and produced a zero order correlation coefficient of  $-0.221$  which was significant beyond the .05 level. This supports the theoretical position noted above. Age was not included in the multivariant analysis due to the high correlation with length of residence. The multicollinearity would have effected the stability of the standard error estimates and would have added nothing to the explanation of the phenomenon under study. It is argued that length of residence serves as a proxy for age.

The relationship of number of children in the home was miniscule in the study. The correlation between number of children living at home and commitment scores was significant and in the expected direction but of little substantive meaning.

It should be noted that the commitment of personal resources to industrial and outdoor recreation development efforts was measured in terms of initial commitment and not long range support. The vested interests model posits that continued support is contingent upon reinforcement by rewards. The theoretical perspective used for this study would suggest that benefits over time must be evident and change programs must produce results to keep people motivated to action.

### Conclusions

The major conclusion drawn from the study is that the "vested interest" model as presented has significant potential for understanding personal commitment of resources to planned change programs. The explained variance would probably have been significantly increased if additional variables which assessed other aspects of personal or group benefit had been included. Change agents must constantly emphasize the costs and benefits of change programs and be able to demonstrate the regional and personal benefits to be derived from specific programs if they wish to motivate people to commit limited resources for goal accomplishment.

The findings also suggest that one of the first activities of development agents should be the creation of a reward system, if one does not exist within the group to be developed. If a reward system does exist, then change agents should focus attention upon the individual

as well as the collective rewards to be gained from the development efforts.

The finding that extensive "latent" support for development activities existed within the study population should be of significant importance to development agents. Lower status people who were nonparticipants in formal organizations were not greatly different from higher status and organizational members in terms of willingness to support development programs. A viable political force exists which has not "traditionally" been actively recruited for development purposes. This does not mean that influentials and formal leaders should be excluded from the development process but rather suggests that the possibility exists for early involvement of committed individuals from many status groups. Change agents should develop implementation strategies which will encourage more active participation in the change process by this very important group of people.

Implicit within the findings is the need for the change agent to identify highly valued and relevant rewards. People are not only motivated for dollar profit but by many types of rewards. Effective change agents will isolate the types of rewards that will most effectively motivate people to action.

Above all else, the change agent must demonstrate that benefits will accrue to the group but to do so may (probably does) require some creativeness. Many development projects take months or years to produce direct benefits but goal accomplishment requires that the participants continue to make the necessary commitments of resources. Where direct benefits are not produced quickly, the change agent must create socially approved forms of rewards to reinforce the personal commitments made.

Thus, symbolic reward systems (praise, community recognition and so forth) may be very useful development tools in the early stages of development while more tangible rewards (jobs, improved services and so forth) may be of primary importance in the later stages. The task remains for the agent to identify the relevant rewards and to effectively apply them.

Table 1. Summary Characteristics of the Sample Selected From Five  
Southeastern Ohio Counties (N = 1493)

---

---

Sex	Males 669 (44.8%)
Mean Age	44.3 years
Mean Lenth of Residence	30.6 years
Mean Years of Education	11.5 years
Mean Number of Children	1.25 children
Home Ownership	80.4%
Percent Unemployed Last Year	22.0%
Full Time Farming	5.5%
Part Time Farming	11.7%
Mean Farm Size (For those engaged in farming)	104.0 acres

---

Table 2. Commitment Scale Items and Reliability Coefficients

Attitude Item	Mean Score	Item Reliability*
1. I would support local increased tax levies to finance the development of industrial location sites.	3.2	0.6152
2. I would support local tax levies for local outdoor recreation projects.	3.2	0.6489
3. I would support local zoning regulations for development purposes.	3.7	0.4456
4. I am willing to donate my time to work for outdoor recreation development in my region.	3.2	0.4201

Kudder-Richardson Test Reliability = 0.6905

\*A value of 0.3 is considered significant.



Table 3: Correlation Matrix For Selected Independent Variables and Commitment Scale Scores (N = 1493)

	Benefit to Self	Industrial Benefit to Region	Recreation Benefit to Region	Children	Tenure	Groups	Income	Scale Commitment
Benefit to Self	1.0							
Industrial Benefit to Region	0.2566	1.0						
Recreation Benefit to Region	0.1248	0.1843	1.0					
Children	0.2671	0.0548	0.0390	1.0				
Tenure	-0.1950	0.0084	-0.0537	-0.2677	1.0			
Groups	-0.0647	0.0240	0.1235	0.0309	0.0714	1.0		
Income	0.0469	0.0227	0.1235	0.1906	-0.1873	0.3001	1.0	
Commitment Scale	0.3413	0.3166	0.3698	0.1432	-0.1772	0.1260	0.1967	1.0

\*Correlations of .051 are significant at the .05 level.

Table 4: Stepwise Regression Findings For Selected Independent Variables and Commitment Scale Scores  
Presented in Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficient Forms (Standard Error of the Estimates  
for b's in Parentheses)

Independent Variables	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7
Recreation Benefits To Region	0.370 <sup>a</sup> 1.339 <sup>b</sup> (0.090) <sup>c</sup>	0.332 1.204 (0.086)	0.302 1.094 (0.085)	0.285 1.030 (0.084)	0.283 1.024 (0.084)	0.275 0.996 (0.084)	0.275 0.997 (0.084)
Benefit to Self	---	0.300 0.808 (0.064)	0.254 0.683 (0.064)	0.248 0.670 (0.063)	0.229 0.618 (0.064)	0.235 0.633 (0.064)	0.233 0.627 (0.066)
Industrial Benefit To Region	---	---	0.200 0.786 (0.097)	0.200 0.790 (0.095)	0.204 0.816 (0.095)	0.202 0.811 (0.094)	0.202 0.811 (0.095)
Income	---	---	---	0.145 0.094 (0.015)	0.129 0.083 (0.015)	0.104 0.067 (0.016)	0.103 0.067 (0.016)
Tenure	---	---	---	---	-0.095 -0.016 (0.004)	-0.104 -0.017 (0.004)	-0.102 -0.017 (0.004)
Groups	---	---	---	---	---	0.079 0.152 (0.046)	0.078 0.151 (0.046)
Children	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.010 0.023* (0.057)
(Constant)	8.05	5.71	3.25	2.66	3.34	3.38	3.36
Adjusted Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ )	0.136	0.224	0.258	0.279	0.287	0.292	0.294

\*Standard error of the estimate is more than twice the regression coefficient.

a = Beta coefficients

b = Unstandardized regression coefficients (b)

c = Standard error of the b

## Bibliography

- Abelson, Robert P. and John W. Tukey  
1970 "Efficient Conversion of Non-Metric Information Into Metric Information," in *The Quantitative Analysis of Social Problems*, edited by Edward R. Tufte, Addison Wesley, Reading: Massachusetts.
- Alinsky, Saul D.  
1971 *Rules For Radicals*, Random House Incorporated, New York.
- Barrows, Richard and Wayne Nilsestuen  
1974 *Recreation and Economic Development In The Kickapoo Valley*, Agricultural Economics Staff Paper Series No. 70, University of Wisconsin, Madison: Wisconsin.
- Beal, George M.  
1958 *How Does Social Change Occur?* RS-284 Iowa State Cooperative Extension Service, Ames: Iowa.
- Beal, George M.  
1964 "Social Action: Instigated Social Change In Large Social Systems," in *Our Changing Rural Society*, edited by James H. Copp, Iowa State University Press, Ames: Iowa.
- Bertrand, Alvin L. and Harold W. Osborne  
1959 *Impact of Industrialization On a Rural Community*, *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. 41, 1127-1134.
- Bertrand, Alvin L. and Harold W. Osborne  
1960 *Rural Industrialization: A Situational Analysis*, *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 25, pp. 387-393.
- Blau, Peter M.  
1964 *Exchange and Power In Social Life*, Wiley, New York.
- Bottum, J. Carroll  
1974 "The Philosophy and Process of Community Development," in *The Development of Rural America*, edited by George Brinkman, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence: Kansas, pp. 3-14.
- Cary, Lee J.  
1970 "Community Development As A Process," University of Missouri Press, Columbia: Missouri.
- Edwards, Allen L.  
1957 *Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York.
- Ekeh, Peter P.  
1974 *Social Exchange Theory*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge: Massachusetts.

Erlich, John L.

- 1974 "The 'Turned-On' Generation: New Anti-establishment Action Roles," in *Strategies of Community Organization*, edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, John E. Tropman, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., Itasca: Illinois, pp. 237-242.

Flacks, Richard

- 1974 "The New Working Class and Strategies For Social Change," in *Strategies of Community Organization*, edited by Fred M. Cox, John L. Erlich, Jack Rothman, John E. Trapman, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., Itasca: Illinois, pp. 227-237.

Goodenough, Ward Hunt

- 1963 *Cooperation In Change*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Havens, A. Eugene

- 1971 "Quest For Societal Development," in *Sociological Perspectives of Domestic Development*, edited by George M. Beal, Ronald C. Powers, E. Walter Coward, Jr., Iowa State University Press, Ames: Iowa, pp. 70-93.

Homans, George Caspar

- 1961 *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York.

Jansen, E. F., Jr., C. T. K. Ching, G. E. Frick  
and C. W. Chandler

- 1971 *Economic Effects of Pawtuckaway State Park*, Research Report No. 17, New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station, Durham: New Hampshire.

Johnson, Joyce and June McCabe

- 1975 *Item Analysis, C6.03.012*, College of Administrative Sciences, mimeograph, The Ohio State University.

Kudder, G. F. and M. W. Richardson

- 1937 *The Theory of the Estimation of Test Reliability*, *Psychometrika*, Vol. 2, No. 3.

Napier, Ted L., John M. Pierce, and Douglas C. Bachtel

- 1977 *A Descriptive Analysis of A Five County Attitude Study: Outdoor Recreation and Industrialization, ESS 540* The Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, The Ohio State University, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center Research Circular Number 230.

Napier, Ted L.

- 1976 *Methodologies For Assessing The Social Impact of Projects Necessitating Forced Relocation of Rural People*, Book Chapter in *The Methodology of Social Impact Assessment*, edited by Kurt Finsterbusch and C. P. Wolf, Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, Inc.

- Neulinger, John  
1976 The Psychology of Leisure, Charles C. Thomas Publisher,  
Springfield: Illinois.
- Powers, Ronald C.  
1971 "Sociological Strategies In A Multicounty Development  
Program: A Case In Sociologing," in Sociological Perspec-  
tives of Domestic Development, edited by George M. Beal,  
Ronald C. Powers, and E. Walter Coward, Jr., Iowa State  
University Press, Ames: Iowa, pp. 184-210.
- Simpson, Richard L.  
1972 Theories of Social Exchange, General Learning Press,  
Morristown: New Jersey.
- Summers, Gene F., Sharon D. Evans, Frank Clemente,  
E. M. Beck, and Jon Minkoff  
1976 Industrial Invasion of Nonmetropolitan America: A  
Quarter Century of Experience, Praeger Publishers, New  
York.
- Turner, Jonathan H.  
1974 The Structure of Sociological Theory, The Dorsey Press,  
Homewood: Illinois.
- Warner, W. Keith and William D. Heffernan  
1967 "The Benefit-Participation Contingency In Voluntary  
Farm Organizations," Rural Sociology, Vol. 32, No. 2,  
pp. 139-153.
- Warren, Roland L.  
1972 The Community In America, Second Edition, Rand McNally  
College Publishing Company, Chicago.
- Whiting, Larry R.  
1974 Rural Industrialization: Problems and Potentials, The  
Iowa State University Press, Ames: Iowa.
- Wiledon, Arthur F.  
1970 Community Development, Bedminster Press, Iotawa: N.J.